DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 379 594 CS 011 989

AUTHOR Mosenthal, James
TITLE A Practice-Oriented vs. Domain-Oriented Approach to Methods Coursework in Literacy Teaching.
PUB DATE Dec 94
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference (44th, San Diego, CA, November 30-December 3, 1994).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Childrens Literature; Classroom Research; Higher Education; Literacy; *Methods Courses; *Preservice Teacher Education; Primary Education; Reading Instruction; *Teaching Methods; *Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Teaching Research

ABSTRACT

Literacy methods coursework usually uses an approach in which prospective teachers are asked to apply domain knowledge (concepts and methods of literacy teaching) in field situations structured for its application. However, that methods can be learned in this way and incorporated into actual situations of schooling has been called into question. A study investigated an alternative method, one that could be called practice-oriented. In this approach, context is focal and domain knowledge is a resource or means for responding to a situation of practice. In the practice-oriented approach, students are asked to work from within ongoing classroom instruction as this is negotiated between them and classroom teachers. As a result, preservice teachers are put in the position of having to identify and resolve problems pertaining to their interactions with children, interactions amongst children, subject matter and teaching routines as they exist in the context of a particular classroom. The study focused on one student who was in her second semester of work in methods of literacy instruction. Interviews with her show how she attempts to work through certain difficulties arising from her efforts to start a free-flowing discussion with children after a reading. These difficulties are resolved creatively and effectively for the most part, but some basic assumptions go unexamined. From the study, two criteria (one suggested: one involves the reasoned conduct of instruction within a situation of practice; a second may involve identifying entrenched aspects of ongoing classroom work, i.e., aspects of a situation which are foundational to ongoing work and as such are invisible, assumed, or unquestioned by the participant. (Contains 11 references.) (TB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 379 594

James Mosenthal
University of Vermont

533 Waterman Building
University of Vermont
Burlington, VT 05405

Tel.: 802-656-3356

A Practice-oriented vs. Domain-oriented Approach to Methods Coursework in Literacy Teaching

Running Head: Methods Coursework

Paper presented at the meeting of the National Reading Conference, December, 1994, San Diego, CA.

CS011985

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Mosenthal
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Practice-oriented vs. Domain-oriented Approach to Methods Coursework in Literacy Teaching

Literacy methods coursework, it can be argued, uses an approach in which prospective teachers are asked to apply domain knowledge (concepts and methods of literacy teaching) in field situations structured for its application. The context of application is less a focus than is the rationale for and facility with self-contained methods of assessment and instruction, e.g. running records, the analysis of invented spellings, discussion strategies for teaching comprehension processes, etc. Learning is reflected in students' ability to carry out and reflect upon these methods, and it is in this sense that I want to refer to students' learning as knowledge-based. A general rationale for a domain-oriented approach is that concepts and methods, learned as part of a knowledge base and practiced in situations set up for their application, prepare prospective teachers for teaching in multiple settings, i.e. the abstracted knowledge is usable if not transferable (see Laurillard, 1993).

However, that methods can be learned in this way and incorporated into actual situations of schooling has been called into question (see Alvermann, Dillon, & O'Brien, 1990; Wendler, Samuels, & Moore, 1989). One implication of this lack of transfer is that learning of methods works from a situation of practice, e.g. actual classroom work, rather than from knowledge-based learning, e.g. outside of the context of actual classroom work. In this study, and in my methods coursework generally, I investigate the implications of such an approach to learning literacy methods, an approach I will call practice-oriented. In this approach context is focal and domain knowledge is a resource or means for responding to a situation of practice. In the practice-oriented approach that I have tried to enact in my teaching, students are asked to work from within ongoing classroom instruction as this is negotiated between them and classroom teachers. As a result, students are put in the position of having to identify and resolve problems pertaining to their interactions with children, interactions amongst children, subject matter, and teaching routines as they exist in the context of a particular classroom (after Schwab, 1978). In this approach students are not asked to apply, as course assignments, domain methods in a field

setting. Rather, learning is reflected in students' ability to engage problem solving in a situation of practice. It is in this sense that I want to refer to students' learning as situated learning (after Brown, Collins, & Duguid, 1989; Lave and Wenger, 1991).

As described above, both domain-oriented and practice-oriented approaches to methods instruction use some kind of field component. A primary difference is the centrality of the field, and whether learning is perceived to be knowledge-based or situated. In the domain-oriented approach accountability is tied to the mastery, conceptually and in application, of methods treated as self-contained practices. Through the evaluation of lesson plans, write-ups of field assignments, examinations, etc. it is possible to assess students' learning, i.e. the extent to which they have mastery of a knowledge base in literacy assessment and instruction. In the practice-oriented approach accountability is tied to the reasoned conduct of instruction and assessment in an actual classroom situation. Unlike the domain-oriented approach, evaluation of students' learning is problematic. Such goals of instruction as "reasoned conduct" or "problem-solving", the indicators of a situated learning, are first a function of the situation and secondarily a function of the uniform, operational forms associated with mastery of self-contained methods.

My intent in this study is to address the question of what situated learning looks like in a practice-oriented approach to coursework in literacy methods, and to reflect upon the adequacy of such learning given the purpose of training prospective teachers to work with children. Specifically, I look at the work and experience of one of my students, Penny, during her work in a methods course in literacy instruction that I taught and which was designed to be practice-oriented. I chose to write about Penny because her case is representative of the strengths and limitations of a practice-oriented approach to methods instruction. Specifically, given responsibility for reading group instruction, Penny works hard to adapt instruction within the framework set for reading group work. Because she works from the situation of her reading group, its routines, and its context in ongoing classroom work, her learning is situated. To the degree that Penny's learning is restricted to the particular classroom, its children, routines, etc. it can be argued that her learning is limited by its particularity.

The issue of Penny's situation is the issue of this study. In a domain-oriented approach to methods instruction, Penny would learn about the concepts and methods of literacy instruction and assessment, and apply them in the field. In our practice-oriented approach, Penny works from within her situation to understand, enact, and adapt the morning activities of the classroom, drawing on domain concepts and methods as they seem appropriate to the problem of the situation.

Method

Penny. The present study looks at Penny's work during her second semester of work in methods of literacy instruction. At this time, she was enrolled in our Elementary Education Program, and completing a year's worth of methods courses in literacy, children's literature, mathematics, social studies, and science prior to student teaching. As part of her first semester work, Penny took the courses on children's literature and literacy instruction taught collaboratively by me and a colleague. This course was field-based. Students spent two mornings a week helping to deliver ongoing instruction in a classroom. For her first semester's work, Penny was placed in an upper elementary grade classroom in a suburban school. In the second semester, Penny took the second course in literacy methods taught by me. Like the first semester's work, this course was field-based and complemented by regular campus classes. For this work, Penny was placed in a primary grade classroom in an urban school.

On her first day in the field Penny and the classroom teacher discussed what her roles would be during the mornings' activities. The teacher's morning schedule consisted of calendar, math, snack, and reading. One primary role for Penny was to work with a small reading group, and to follow the weekly reading contract and the routines of that contract. The contract was structured by several main activities: read new book with a teacher, book activity, journal writing, spelling, phonics and/or keywords.

Course Instruction. For the second course in literacy methods, students met with me regularly on campus. These classes focused on domain concepts and methods, though usually discussed in terms of students' experiences in the field. A major part of instruction occurred in

the field. While in the field, students were observed by me and debriefed with me. In the interactions in the field the focus was on problems and issues that students' identified. In other words, my role in these debriefings was to follow their lead in identifying and discussing the issues of their practice. A third component of instruction was conferences I held with small groups of students three times over the course of the semester. The focus of these conferences was to discuss issues the students raised about their responsibilities and experiences in the field, as they had documented and reflected upon them in the assignments for the course. (See Author, 1994a on conferencing with students in professional education coursework.)

Course assignments were designed to be responsive to students' field situations. Students were required to keep a weekly teaching log of their work in the field, develop a child's literacy portfolio - a form of portfolio assessment, maintain a journal of assigned and self-selected readings, and, at the end of the term, to construct their own teacher portfolio based on a selection of entries from the log, child portfolio, and journal assignments. (See Author, 1994b on the construction of teacher portfolios in professional education coursework.)

Data collection and analysis. I kept on file all course related materials. All students' work products were collected over the time of the semester, including the Teaching Log, Child's Literacy Portfolio, Content Journal, and Teacher Portfolio. For Penny's work, I summarized the entries for her log, child portfolio, content journal, and teacher portfolio. I maintained field notes of my observations and debriefings with all students, and summarized those that involved Penny. I kept a journal of my reflections on all campus, field, and conference interactions with students. I tape-recorded and transcribed all my conferences with students. After the completion of the semester I tape-recorded and transcribed separate interviews with Penny and four other volunteers. Penny's conferences and interview were analyzed for recurrent themes following the comparative method of Glaser and Strauss (1967).

In the interview participants constructed and explained a timeline of salient experiences in the field. I analyzed the experience that was chronologically first on Penny's timeline in order to determine what was salient at a time when she was probably still uncertain about her role in

the classroom and about teaching literacy, and at a critical juncture in her learning to the extent that she identified the experience as salient. The experience Penny identified was her unsuccessful attempt to generate "free-flowing discussion" in the reading group for which she had responsibility. To unpack this experience, I went back to all data sources and recorded what had transpired preceding, during, and after the time of the experience identified by Penny. In so doing I reconstructed a history of the experience. In this way, I was able to look at Penny in her situation and to reconstruct an idea of what she was learning in her situation. In other words, I reconstruct how Penny reflected upon and attempted to resolve a practical problem - generating free-flowing discussion - and in so doing characterize aspects of Penny's situated learning.

A Problem: Generating Free-Flowing Group Discussion

In her interview with me at the end of the term, Penny describes a salient experience, around her third week in the field, when she felt she had not prepared effectively. As I was to find out, Penny describes a time when she incorporated an activity called "the character writing activity," taken from one of the course readings (Barr & Johnson, 1991). I observed and debriefed with Penny on the occasion. In the interview Penny states:

> [I] was basically trying to get a lively group discussion [while] following the [reading] contract . . . But my questions were far too specific and not broad based at all. . . You told me just to be a facilitator rather than an interrogator. That helped a lot. Just putting it that bluntly helped me because now I know . . . That helped me to generate group discussion well around week 4 . . .

Generating a group discussion emerges as a problem for Penny as a result of this episode.

Observing and debriefing the "character writing activity", I observed Penny's attempt to generate a "lively" group discussion within the framework of the reading contract. Penny chose the character writing activity as a way of structuring the discussion of the story during the read-to-a-teacher phase of the reading contract. In our reading, the character writing activity is identified as a way of integrating reading and writing for capable readers. It focuses on character development. Students use worksheets labeled "appearance," "behavior," and "feelings and

thoughts." As students read they write down descriptors under each of these categories. After reading, students' depiction of the same character are compared in a pre-writing discussion. Then students write their own description of the character.

I came in at the end of the discussion of a story. Penny was asking the children in her reading group questions about the father character in the story that they were reading. I noted down the following interaction (P=Penny, C=child):

P: What were the movements of the father?

C: Quick?

P: Why?

C: If they were slow they wouldn't hear footsteps.

P: Is it in the book?

C: [no response]

P: Look on page 10. Start reading from "where are you."

C: [children read]

P: How does he walk?

C: Slowly.

P: Right.

Penny wrote the descriptors "quick" and "slowly" on the chart labeled "appearance." Two other charts were on the table labeled "behavior" and "feelings and thoughts." Here, Penny adapts the worksheets suggested by the character writing activity to create three charts. She wrote the descriptors on each of the charts based on what the children said in discussion, rather than have the children fill out their own worksheets during silent reading.

The above interaction ended the discussion of the story. It is an abrupt closure. Penny asked the children to write responses in their reading journal to questions that she had generated and written into each of the children's journal. Penny's questions were as follows: "Describe the boys' father to me. What does he look like? Is he a nice or mean person? Does he surprise you at all during the story?" Penny then told the children to use the information on the charts as aids in

their journal writing. Based on the questions and the charts the children reiterate information discussed and documented. For example, one child wrote the following (information taken from the charts is in italics):

Dear Penny,

[The boys'] father is *nice*

to them some tim. [The boys]

eat the pudding they got in troble

too. The father *surprise me we he said*

[they] is going to get a

beting and a wuping.

The father is *a big man*

he has black hair too.

At the beginning of our debriefing I asked Penny how she thought the activity went. Penny said that the discussion had been "tough". She explained that she had wanted to move to a consideration of the father figure who was a complex character in the story. She said that she had "wanted a free flowing discussion", but that it didn't happen. I described to Penny what I had seen during the discussion. Then I raised the issue of how the discussion might have been different or revised. Penny suggested letting the children write their own questions for their journal entry. In my journal reflections, I noted that Penny seemed anxious at the beginning of our debriefing and unwilling to talk about her idea or her perspective on the discussion generally.

Because of this perception of Penny's state of mind, I purposefully engaged in a certain amount of "telling" (see Ball and Chazen, 1994) given Penny's identification of the discussion problem and her apparent frustration. I suggested that the toughness of the interaction might be alleviated by asking more responsive, open-ended questions such as, "Do you like the father? Why?" that might facilitate a free-flowing discussion. I suggested that this could be modeled by Penny by saying, "I like the father because . . . What do you think of him?". I stressed that these

types of questions could be followed up by predictions based on the discussion of the father. These alternatives were readily endorsed by Penny.

Penny's reflection on the character writing activity. Penny wrote up this episode as an entry in her Teaching Log. She writes that it was to be a "post reading discussion" of a story and that her "goal was to initiate a free-flowing discussion. Specifically, I wanted [the children] to gain an understanding of the story's theme, and develop an appreciation for one of the main characters." As documentation for the log entry, Penny includes the several parts of her plan for the adapted reading contract, the charts detailing aspects of the character of the father, and the children's journal entries. Penny writes in the assessment section of her Teaching Log entry that she thought the lesson went well and that the children showed a good grasp of character and theme.

Most important to Penny, however, was that she generate a free-flowing discussion during or after the "read to the teacher" component of the reading contract. This problem emerges as key for Penny. In her Teaching Log Penny writes:

> Although the girls made some interesting comments, I never generated the free-flowing discussion that I hoped for. At times I felt like an interrogator. . . During the activity I found myself getting frustrated. This resulted in me asking questions where the correct answer was implied in the actual questions [I asked] . . . To generate the free-flowing discussion that I want, I need to start off the discussion with some general, broad-based questions [like] "How did you like the story?" or "What was your favorite part?" . . . [Though] I feel the group has a solid understanding of the story's theme . . . and an appreciation of the [father] character, I don't feel [they] put their best effort into their journal entries . . . To get over this obstacle, I must make my interactions with this group more lively and meaningful to them.

Thus, the problem Penny identifies is the problem of generating free-flowing discussion. Interestingly, such discussion functions more as an assumption about how the "character writing activity" will transpire. The "character writing activity" structures the activity but no bridge is

built between this activity and free-flowing discussion. The activity accomplishes the goal of a legitimate comprehension activity but, as Penny finds out, free-flowing discussion is not an inherent quality of such an activity. It is a much more complex problem space that emerges for Penny within the first weeks in the field. It is a "felt" problem and not an abstracted problem, for, as Penny says, she was frustrated. Thus the intensity or fullness of Penny's participation in her mentor's classroom is enhanced by the ongoing responsibility to carry out instruction with the reading group. Given the situation of her teaching, she is positioned to work to resolve the problem.

A Resolution to the Discussion Problem

Penny does seem to resolve the problem of free-flowing discussion. Her resolution includes asking open-ended, broad-based questions as a routine means for generating group discussion. In our interview Penny indicates that this is the case. As noted above, she says that confronting her interrogation tactics in practice, reflectively, and in interaction with me in our debriefing "helped me to generate group discussion well around week four." With respect to this work, Penny clarifies that her adaptation of the reading contract was done within the prescribed activities of the reading contract on any given day, and that free-flowing discussion was an issue addressed within the prescribed activities of the reading contract:

> One of the things on the contract was "read to a teacher". So we would read the chapter together, and once we finished then I would try to get them into a group discussion on what we read. Then we would get into reading journals or something like that. [As for the group discussion], once I got the hang of asking broad-based questions, I never sat there with a list of questions, I would just say, "What did you guys think of the chapter?" That would be it and it would start off the whole [discussion].

Other evidence that Penny resolves the problem of free-flowing discussion comes from her Child's Portfolio. One week after the group discussion activity, Penny documents and reflects upon the predictions of the child, 'D', who was the subject of her Child's Portfolio. 'D' was also a

member of Penny's reading group. Concerned with assessing 'D's' comprehension, Penny writes that she wanted to do a "pre-reading activity" for a new story the group is reading in which she asks the group to make predictions based on the title and illustrations. She writes that her goal was "to get a sense of the group's predicting skills", especially 'D's'. In her assessment of 'D's' predictions, Penny writes that 'D' was able to predict the topic of the story from the title, and that she was able to see how the story progressed from the illustrations. In her documentation, Penny provides 'D's' predictions from notes she took during the discussion of the story, and describes how they are reasonable given the information presented. Though she never mentions it, it appears that there is more of a free-flowing discussion around predicting, one of the types of broad-based questions mentioned in our debriefing of the group discussion activity.

Other evidence that Penny incorporates broad-based questions as a routine way of generating free-flowing group discussion in the read-to-the-teacher components of the daily reading contract come in subsequent Teaching Log entries. During week 6 in the field, Penny documents and reflects upon her attempt to incorporate a paragraph cloze activity into the reading contract. After completing the cloze activity Penny discusses the children's responses with them. In the assessment section of her log entry she states, "I used their answers to stimulate group discussion, specifically, predicting. This led to a lively discussion." During week 7, Penny uses her Teaching Log to document and reflect upon her effort to prepare the children for the resolution of the story in discussion of the penultimate chapter. In her assessment of the reading group work, Penny states: "Each of the students participated in a lively group discussion. . . In the past it has been a struggle generating lively discussion. . . Predictions were also made. . . I felt the group was ready for the resolution."

Penny's Situated Learning

The question, "What method of comprehension instruction does Penny learn?" may be misconceived, for it highlights, in the present case, her use of the character writing activity. In practice-oriented coursework the more appropriate question may be, "What method does Penny construct for the situation in which she works, and to what extent does this show 'reasoned

conduct' of reading group instruction?" At the least, Penny's method is intentional and embedded in the history of her participation in her mentor's classroom. She works from the situation of her practice.

The domain concepts and methods she draws upon as resources for the activity in question are the concept of a free-flowing discussion and the self-contained method of the character writing activity. The former concept functions as an overarching goal for Penny's instruction whereas the character writing activity functions to structure a single day's activity. In fact, Penny does not use it again though she will adapt other self-contained methods encountered in her readings to structure her daily activity, e.g. the paragraph cloze activity. Neither of these activities were discussed or taught on campus, while the concept of discussion and the use of responsive, open-ended questions such as prediction were taught on campus.

In general, Penny, during the first weeks of her time with the reading group, makes adaptations of the reading contract. She starts by writing her own journal questions, as she did for the group discussion activity I observed. She works to structure the read-to-the-teacher time by using such activities as the character writing activity. She also makes the effort to connect or make coherent the read-to-the-teacher portion of the reading contract and the journal writing, as when she asked her group to write about the character of the father after discussion of the father character using the character writing activity.

Penny's choice of the character writing activity can be questioned. The activity was not designed for beginning readers. However, Penny's adaptation of the activity seems to make it accessible to the children. Rather than have the children fill out the worksheets on the character of the father during silent reading, Penny discusses the father character as a post-reading activity and takes over the task of writing down the descriptors of the father character. Her journal questions directly reflect the focus of discussion. A positive consequence of the adaptation is that the children are able to write about the father character based on Penny's questions and using her record of their comments on the charts. A negative consequence is that the children seem so focused on the descriptors and the set of journal questions that their entries read as a non-

cohesive list of character attributes rather than as a coherent description of the father character. As Penny notes, this may be the result of a discussion that degenerates into text-explicit questioning with correct answers as opposed to being a free-flowing discussion. Over time, if not because of her ongoing responsibility for her reading group, Penny resolves the problem of generating free-flowing discussion by incorporating broad-based questions to guide group discussion.

Given the above appraisal of Penny's work, her conduct of instruction is "reasoned" based on her perception of the problems she perceives and works to resolve. Because Penny conceives of her instruction in terms of process variables (free-flowing discussion, broad-based questions, prediction), content variables (the concern for character, theme), and pedagogical variables (constructing coherent contract work, choosing and adapting self-contained methods), she shows a situation-specific competence or method. It is a method that evolves out of her immersion in the social and historical context of her mentor's classroom. Her unit of analysis is the instructional episode - not the self-contained method. Each instance of reading group work, organized around the reading contract, is an episode in the narrative of Penny's evolving, practical understanding of reading group work. It is Penny's practical understanding of this work that is the outcome of interest in a practice-oriented approach to methods coursework.

A Dilemma for a Practice-Oriented Approach to Methods Instruction

If group discussion is a practice Penny comes to terms with in the context of the reading contract, the reading contract itself is something Penny and I never address. The reading contract is not "wrong" or "right". It is one teacher's approach to reading instruction given the situation of her teaching. Though Penny learns about teaching reading from the experience of using the reading contract, she does not ask the larger question of ways in which this method is or is not effective, what alternatives are possible in the context of the particular classroom and in general.

With respect to the reading contract, Penny works within the constraints and tradition of the classroom teacher's reading instruction. The reading contract occupies a physical and routine instructional space in the classroom. As an entrenched aspect of classroom instruction, it is

difficult to rethink, alter, or adapt. What is problematic in our practice-oriented approach, is that Penny and I do not identify or recognize the reading contract as an issue in the same way that we identify group discussion as an issue. To an extent, the contract is a given and thus invisible to us because of its central role in organizing the ongoing work of the morning.

This is a dilemma for the practice-oriented approach to methods instruction. Penny's participation provides her the opportunity to learn the complexity of a classroom's ongoing work, and to adapt instructional activity according to her own criteria for effective teaching as these criteria are shaped by the situation of her work. However, Penny's situation also defines constraints that she may not recognize as constraints. The reading contract is an example.

It is evident that the entrenchment of the reading contract is the flip or dark side of Penny's situated learning. As a result, though the appeal of a reflective practical competence is tangible in Penny's work, the criteria and standards for such competence remain unclear in methods coursework in teacher education programs. From the study of Penny's work, two criteria suggest themselves. One criteria involves the reasoned conduct of instruction within a situation of practice. Most of this study provides evidence for Penny's reasoned conduct of reading group instruction. A second criteria may involve identifying entrenched aspects of ongoing classroom work, i.e. aspects of a situation which are foundational to ongoing work and as such are invisible, assumed, or unquestioned by the participant. The issue of recognition recalls the ethnographer's dictum to make the familiar strange. In my methods coursework, it comes back to me, the teacher educator, to teach such identification or recognition as a necessary component of prospective teachers' situated learning, and of a practice-oriented approach to methods instruction.

References

Author. (1994a). The resolution of uncertainty in practice: Field experience, conferences, and portfolios in undergraduate methods instruction. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Author. (1994b). Constructing knowledge and expertise in literacy teaching: Portfolios in undergraduate teacher education. In D. Leu and C. Kinzer (Eds.), Forty-third Yearbook of the National Reading Conference. Chicago: National Reading Conference.

Alvermann, D.E., O'Brien, D.G., Dillon, D.R. (Fall, 1990). What teachers do when they say they're having discussions of content area reading assignments: A qualitative analysis. Reading Research Quarterly, 25, 4, 296-322.

Ball, D. and Chazen, D. (1994). "An examination of teacher telling in constructivist mathematics pedagogy: Not just excusable but essential." Paper present at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Barr, R. & Johnson, B. (1991). Teaching reading in elementary classrooms. NY: Longman.

Brown, J., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (Jan.-Feb., 1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. Educational Researcher, 18(1), 32-42.

Glaser, B.G., & Strauss, A.L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research. Chicago: Aldine.

Laurillard, D. (1993). Rethinking university teaching. NY: Routledge.

Lave, J. and Wenger, E. (1991). Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. NY: Cambridge University Press.

Schwab, J.J. (1978). The practical: Translation into curriculum. In I. Westbury & N. Wilkof (Eds.), Science, curriculum and liberal education: Selected essays. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 365-383.

Wendler, D., Samuels, S.J., and Moore, V.K. (1989). Comprehension instruction of award-winning teachers, teachers with master's degrees, and other teachers. Reading Research Quarterly, 24, 4, 382-401.